

444

3805

W

St. JUSTIN

97

The PHILOSOPHER and MARTYR,

H I S

EXHORTATIONS

T O T H E

G E N T I L E S.

Translated from the Greek by the Reverend Mr. THOMAS
MOSES one of the Ministers of St. PAUL's CHAPEL in
Aberdeen.

*If any of you lack Wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to
all men liberally.* ——— JAMES i. 5.

A B E R D E E N:

Printed by F. DOUGLASS and W. MURRAY, sold by C.
HITCH and L. HAWES in *Pater-Noster-Row London*, Mr.
CHARNLY in *Newcastle*, A. KINCAID and A. DONALDSON
in *Edinburgh*, and by the said F. DOUGLASS at *Aberdeen*.

M,DCC,LVII.

[Price ONE SHILLING.]

ST. JUSTIN

THE PHILOSOPHER and MARTYR

EXHIBITIONS

GENERAL



THE BRITISH MUSEUM

EXHIBITIONS

GENERAL

ST. JUSTIN

T O T H E

Right WORSHIPFUL, the Reverend

THOMAS SHARP,

DOCTOR of DIVINITY, ARCH-DEACON

of the Archdeaconry of *Northum-*

berland, PREBENDARY of *Durham*,

&c. &c.

THE following TRANSLATION is
humbly submitted and dedicated by
his WORSHIP'S

Most obedient,

most obliged

and most humble Servant,

Aberdeen, } THOMAS MOSES.
Jan. 3d, 1757. }

TO THE

Right Worshipful, the Reverend

THOMAS SHARP,

Doctor of Divinity, Arch-Deacon

of the Archdeaconry of North-

ampton, Parson of North-

ampton.



The following

manuscript is submitted and delivered by

his Worshipful

Most Excellent

most obliged

and most humble servant

Thomas Sharp }
Jan. 21. 1757.

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

ST. Justin the Philosopher and Martyr, author of these exhortations, was of the province of Samaria, though not a Samaritan properly so called, but the son of Priscus Bacchius one of those Grecian colonists whom Vespasian is supposed to have sent thither. This great man bred up in Paganism, was an eminent philosopher and made a considerable figure among the gentiles: But being dissatisfied with his principles, and having enquired after the Truth among the different sects of philosophers, as himself, in his dialogue with Tryphon the Jew, relates, he found all his labour therein fruitless; and confesseth that the study of the gentile philosophy only perplexed and involved him in greater doubts and difficulties; at last meeting with a christian, a grave and serious old man, who mildly reproved him as more fond of seeking after knowledge than the practice of truth; this man shewed him that Plato and the philosophers had not a right knowledge of God nor of the reasonable soul: that the inspired prophets were the only wise men whom God had enabled by prophecy and miracle to establish the truth, and not by disputes and tedious reasonings which few are able to understand.

About the year of our Lord 154 in spite of all the oppositions of prejudice and education, he embraced Christianity, esteeming it the most useful and certain Philosophy in the world. He then justified

fied the change he had made and laid open the truths of christianity with great energy, a noble simplicity and manly courage; and as he came from a false to a true religion, he had a double advantage of knowing all the arguments on both sides, and how to force the weakness of the side he left with the strength of that he came over to. These two exhortations, more particularly directed to the Grecian-gentiles, appear to have been his first attack; we have Eusebius's authority that they are the works of this celebrated philosopher; Eusebius doth not call them by the title they now bear, Exhortations, but by that of Confutations, Elenchos, *Euf. lib. iv. ch. 18.* And it is a farther confirmation that they are the works of this converted philosopher; that Eusebius records the same reasons for Justin's having changed his principles which Justin himself gives in his second exhortation, namely, That his separation from the religion of the gentiles was not without reason, or without duely weighing the matter, but because he found nothing holy or acceptable to God in it. In those exhortations, although his arguments and sentiments be not all of them thought unexceptionable, yet doth he learnedly expose the pagan religion, and shew that all the philosophick notions of the gentiles were full of incertainties and contradictions, that their gods were all imaginary, and their religion ridiculous, absurd, yea detestable, by which, according to his principal intention, he proves the necessity of an higher guide for man: and this guide he declares to be the holy scriptures. The method he takes is to argue with
 them

them upon their own principles, and shows them
 that notwithstanding the instability and weakness
 of human reason, yet their philosophers and poets,
 Orpheus, Homer, Plato, Socrates and Sophocles,
 had been forced to declare many things in favour
 of the Christian doctrine, especially concerning the
 one necessary self-existent and eternal Being:
 nor doth he, as I think, lay any stress on the Sy-
 biline Oracles in any other sense than to manifest
 how inconsistently they acted with themselves
 who held the Oracles in great reverence, yet
 could reject that Oracle's predictions. Taken in
 this light neither Justin Martyr nor the primi-
 tive fathers of the church can justly deserve that
 obloquy so freely bestowed on them. For the
 Christians who had disputes with them, saw that
 the heathens were perswaded that there was some-
 thing supernatural in their Oracles, and they
 did not desire to confute this by a long train of
 enquiries and arguments; but rather to turn them
 against the heathens themselves; as indeed it is
 too common to man in defence of his own principles
 to make use of advantages not due to them, and
 give them props of which they have no need. But
 if with the true proofs of our religion those pri-
 mitive fathers have left us other proofs which may
 be suspected, it is our part to receive that only from
 them which is authentic, and to pardon their zeal
 for so good a cause, who have furnished us with
 more proofs than there was any necessity for. It
 was this that engaged me to lay these exhortations
 before the English reader: and if justifiable I hope
 the linguist will have no reason to complain: for
 the

the subject being out of the common way of reading, the terms are not easily understood by the ordinary proficient in the Greek language, as I found by experience, nor doth the Latin translation give much help, which by being too verbal is often more obscure than the original. Giving Pope's words in the quotations from Homer will be acceptable to the reader, and be some excuse for the meaner performances I have made in the other poetical versions, which necessity put me upon. The first line in Homer's Iliad is known to the learned to have an undue measure, I purposed to have imitated him in English but afterwards judged it would read too harsh.

There are other works of this learned philosopher and pious christian, namely, two apologies writ in defence of the then persecuted Christians, the one presented to Antoninus Pius, the other to his successor Marcus Antoninus the philosopher. He wrote a dialogue with Tryphon the Jew in defence of Christianity against the Jews, both of these works are translated into English already. Justin also wrote a treatise on the unity of God; another entitled Psalter. Other works go under his name though not so well attested to be his. And when he had thus learnedly defended Christianity with his pen, he at last laid down his life in defence of it, being, upon the accusation of Crescens the Cynic philosopher, and according to the sentence pronounced against those who refused to do sacrifice to the gods, first scourged and then beheaded about the year of our Lord 166.

St.

St. J U S T I N

The PHILOSOPHER and MARTYR, his
Exhortation to the GENTILES.

I Open my exhortation to you, O Grecians, with my prayer, that God would enable me to speak what is right, and grant that you, laying aside your former contentious dispositions, and leaving the errors of your forefathers, may now at length embrace an useful doctrine.

Not supposing that you will offend against your ancestors by approving what is contrary to the ill grounded sentiments which they before entertained. For a diligent enquiry into things, even such as have been judged *right*, frequently shews them to be otherwise, the real truth being extorted by a greater accuracy of examination.

The proposed enquiry now is, *Which is the true Religion?* Nor can any enquiry be thought preferable to this, by men who would conduct their lives in safety, because of that Judgment which shall come upon all men when this life is at an end: Which *Judgment*, not only our holy forefathers, prophets and lawgivers, but also those whom we look upon as wise men among you, such as your poets and philoso-
A
phers

phers, when speaking of divine Truths do all proclaim.

And I judge that I shall take a right method herein if I shall in the first place make these enquiries; Who were the authors of your religious tenets, and also of ours? What kind of persons they were? And in what times they lived? that they, who have formerly received a false religion from their ancestors, may now be ashamed of it, and disengaged from their long imbibed errors.

As for us, we shall openly and fully manifest ourselves to be followers of the religion of our godly ancestors. But from whom do you, O Grecians, derive your religion? Is it from the poets? Of how small account will that be with men vers'd in poetical stories! such will know, that nothing can be more ridiculous than the *Theogony* of the poets. This appears from Homer the prince and the first of all the poets: for according to him, the source and origin of the gods themselves is from water, thus:

*Where the great parents (sacred source of gods)
Ocean and Tethys their old empire keep.*

Il. xiv. 201.

Let us next see what opinion the same poet had of him who is esteemed the chief of the gods, and whom he often stiles, *Father of the gods and Father of men*. He makes him to hold the scale of battle in his hand, thus:

Great

Great Jove but turns it, and the victor dies.

Il. xix. 224.

He makes him also the author of perjury among the Trojans by means of his daughter: he represents him as a passionate lover; as one heavily lamenting his troubles; howling over his afflictions; circumvented by the rest of the gods; and bewailing his own son *Sarpedon* thus;

*The hour draws on, the destinies ordain,
My godlike son shall press the Phrygian plain:
Already on the verge of death he stands;
His life is ow'd to fierce Patroclus' hands;
What passions in a parent's breast debate!*

Il. xvi. 443.

He introduceth him bewailing *Hector*, thus:

*Unworthy sight! the man below'd of heav'n,
Behold inglorious round yon city driv'n!
My heart partakes the gen'rous Hector's pain:*

Il. xxii. 168.

And his following lines describe *Jove's* perilous case from the other gods,

*When the bright partner of his awful reign,
The warlike maid, and monarch of the main,
The traitor-gods, by mad ambition driv'n,
Durst threat with chains th'omnipotence of
heav'n.*

Il. i. 399.

unless

unless therefore those happy gods had dreaded him whom the gods call Briareus, your Jupiter had been bound in chains. And as to Jove's lustful amours, the testimony is full from his own mouth, whom Homer introduceth addressing Juno thus,

*Ne'er did my soul so strong a passion prove,
Or for an earthly or an heavenly love;
Not when I press'd Ixion's matchless dame,
Whence rose Perithous like the gods in fame.
Not when fair Danae felt the show'r of gold
Stream into life, whence Perseus brave and bold.
Not thus I burn'd for either Theban dame,
(Bacchus from this, from that Alcides came.)
Not Phœnix' daughter, beautiful and young,
Whence godlike Rhadamanth and Minos sprung,
Not thus I burn'd for fair Latona's face,
Nor comlier Ceres' more majestic grace,
Not thus ev'n for thy self I felt desire
As now my veins receive the pleasing fire.*

Il. xiv. 315.

Let us next see from Homer's poems what sentiments to form of the other gods: Here it will be necessary to relate their great sufferings from men. And from Homer we learn how Mars and Venus were wounded by Diomed; and many other of their afflictions we find in the story of Dione consoling Venus; thus,

*Dione then. Thy wrongs with patience bear,
And share those griefs inferiour pow'rs must share;
Unnumber'd*

Unnumber'd woes mankind from us sustain,
 And men with woes afflict the gods again.
 The mighty Mars in mortal fetters bound,
 And lodg'd in brazen dungeons under ground,
 Full thirteen moons imprison'd roar'd in vain,
 Otus and Ephialtes held the chain:
 Perhaps had perish'd; had not Hermes' care
 Restor'd the groaning god to upper air.
 Great Juno's self has born the weight of pain,
 Th' imperial partner of the heav'nly reign;
 Amphitryon's son infix'd the deadly dart,
 And fill'd with anguish her immortal heart.
 Ev'n hell's grim king Alcides' pow'r confest,
 The shaft found entrance in his iron breast;
 To Jove's high palace for a cure he fled,
 Pierc'd in his own dominions of the dead;
 Where Pæon sprinkling heav'nly balm around
 Asswag'd the glowing pangs and heal'd the wound.

Il. v. 482.

Or would you have related to you the battles
 of the gods among themselves, the same poet
 shall do it.

Such wars th'immortals wage: such horrors rend
 The world's great concave when the gods contend.
 First silver-shafted Phæbus took the plain
 Against blue Neptune, monarch of the main:
 The god of arms his giant bulk display'd
 Oppos'd to Pallas, war's triumphant maid.
 Against Latona march'd the son of May;
 The quiver'd Dian sister of the Day.

(Her

*(Her golden arrows sounding at her side)
Saturnia, majesty of heav'n defy'd.*

Il. xx. 66.

These, and such like, are the lessons which Homer hath taught you concerning the gods; and if you give credit to these your most eminent poets, and to those who have transmitted the genealogies of your gods, you must either believe them to be such as they described them, or else disbelieve their being gods.

Or if you will excuse your poets, allowing them a poetical licence to feign fables, and to speak many things of the gods in a visionary and fabulous manner, far from truth: Then what others will you acknowledge for your instructors in religion? And from whom do you say did those instructors receive that religion themselves? It being impossible for men, who have not been taught by those who know these things, ever of themselves to attain the knowledge of such sublime and divine matters. Perhaps you will say, that the philosophers are men sufficiently wise in these things: for when the religion of your poets is objected to you, you are wont to fly to these as your infallible guides. It seems here necessary to begin from the earliest account of things. Wherefore, tracing from this source the different sentiments of the philosophers, I shall shew you that their theology is yet more ridiculous than that of your poets.

Thales

Thales the Milesian, the first teacher of natural philosophy, affirmed *water* to be the first principle of all things, saying, "All things take their beginning from *water*; and into *water* shall all be dissolved again."

Anaximander comes boldly after him from Miletus also, and he declares *infinity* to be the first principle of things; "That from infinity all things are at first generated, and into this infinity all things return when disunited by corruption."

Anaximenes is the third, he was also a Milesian, he held *air* to be the beginning of all things, and that all things were dissolved into *air* again.

Heraclitus the Ephesian asserts *fire* to be the first principle; "That every thing is made of *fire* and will at last be resolved into it again."

Anaxagoras of Clazomenæ derives the beginning of all things from *homogeneous particles*.

Archelaus, the son of Apollodorus the Athenian, held an infinity of *air*, and that all things take their beginning from its *density* and *rarity*. All those deducing their tenets from *Thales* cultivated what they called their natural philosophy. Afterwards *Pythagoras* the son of Mnesarchus the Samnian, formed a quite different system: he makes *numbers* and their *proportions* the first principles; what ariseth from thence he calls *harmony*, makes the *elements* to be compounded of both, and which he

he distinguished by the names of *monad* and the indeterminate *duad*.

Epicurus the son of Neocles the Athenian, makes *atoms* the first principles of all things. These atoms he makes perceptible only in the idea, free from all vacuum, solid, self existent, incorruptible, which can neither be separated, receive form or admit alteration of parts.

Empedocles, the son of Meto of Agrigentum called *fire, air, water* and *earth* four elements; and said that there were two principal powers, *amity* and *discord*; of these he said the one was unitive, the other disjunctive of all things.

Do not you here observe the greatest confusion among your wise men; And are these your acknowledged instructors in divine matters? Are they not all of different opinions; some holding *water*, some *fire*, some *air*, some one thing, some another to be the first principles of things; and every one of them artfully abetting by elaborate discourses their own opinions to the exposing each other's errors. And are not all that I have said their very words?

How then O Grecians, can you ever think yourselves secure! How can you hope ever to learn the true religion from teachers who can never agree among themselves, never unite in the same sentiments!

But some perhaps who will not quit their old errors say, they take not their religion from those forementioned philosophers, but from the determinations of those who, in the opinion

nion of all men, are most eminent for wisdom and virtue, namely, Plato and Aristotle; acknowledging these for the men that rightly understand the true and perfect religion: but I would again willingly ask those men this one thing: Of whom did those philosophers receive that knowledge? For it is impossible for men, who have not been instructed therein, ever of themselves to attain the knowledge of such sublime and divine truths, or to teach others rightly therein. Wherefore I think it expedient in the next place to enquire into their opinions, that we may see whether or no these do not likewise contradict each other: for if we shall find them disagreeing, we shall therein easily discover the ignorance of these men also.

Plato, like one newly come from the celestial regions, where he had perfectly learnt, yea seen with his eyes the nature of every thing, saith, "The supreme Being exists in a fiery essence:" but, contrary to this, *Aristotle*, in that work of his to Alexander the Macedonian, concisely relating the doctrine of his own philosophy, directly and fully abolisheth that of Plato's, saying, "God is not in a fiery essence:" but conceiving some kind of fifth æthereal immoveable matter, in this he placeth his God: his words are, "God is not in a fiery essence, as some have profanely asserted." And a little after as if not satisfied with this reproach cast upon Plato, he cites Homer a
B
witness

witness for the truth of his doctrine of the æthereal matter; and for which doctrine he saith Plato ejects him out of his commonwealth as a liar, and servile follower of phantastick representations of truth. *Aristotle* proves Homer's sentiments the same with his own from these words,

*O'er the wide clouds and o'er the starry plain,
Æthereal Jove extends his high domain:*

Il. xv. 192.

Thus he is willing to prove the credibility of his own opinion by the testimony of Homer, when it makes for him; but forgets that according to himself many of Homer's opinions are apparently false. *Thales* the Milesian was the first professed philosopher among the Grecians, who, taking his handle from what Homer had said, will discredit Aristotle's first opinions of principles: whereas *Aristotle* makes God and matter the first principles of all things; *Thales* the most antient of all the philosophers derives their beginning from *water*, saying, "All things derive their origin from *water*, and into *water* are all again dissolved." And he forms his conjectures thus, First, The natural seed whence all living creatures have their beginning, is humid: secondly, All plants are nourished by moisture, and by moisture produce their fruit, of which when once deprived they wither away: and to give more weight to these conjectures,

jectures, he cites Homer as a man worthy of credit giving testimony thereto, thus, "ocean progenitor of gods and source of things."

The fire of all, old ocean owns my reign.

Il. xiv. 246.

Might not Thales here reply upon Aristotle thus, Why, O Aristotle, do you make use of Homer as an infallible oracle when you would subvert Plato's doctrine, and yet where we produce it as contrary to your own, there you allow him mistaken? Nor is this the only point in which these men, held by you in such veneration, differ the one from the other, as is easily demonstrable.

According to Plato there are three first principles of the universe, God, matter and idea. God as the creator of all things: matter as what undergoes the first formation of what is formed, and is the subject for God to work upon; and idea as the patern of every one of those things which are formed: whereas Aristotle takes no notice of *idea* as a principle, and only reckons two, *God* and *matter*. Farther, Plato places his supreme God and ideas in the immoveable orb of the Cœlum empyreum; whereas Aristotle after his supreme God mentions not *ideas*, but speaks of certain *intelligences* as of gods.

Thus do your two most celebrated philosophers disagree about divine matters. And we

may be well assured that those men can never be thought worthy of credit when treating on the things in heaven, who, when speaking on what belongs to ourselves on earth, never agree. And this is apparently the case of these men in their treatises concerning the human soul, wherein their sentiments no ways coincide.

With Plato the soul consists of three parts: the *rational*, *irascible*, and *concupiscible*: but Aristotle will not allow such generality in the soul as this, wherein its corruptible parts would be in such rotation, therefore only grants the *rational*.

Plato proclaims all souls immortal: whereas Aristotle calls the soul *perfection*, yet allows it not to be immortal but mortal. Plato saith the soul is always in motion: but Aristotle places his perfect soul immoveable in its center, yet directing all motion, and going along with it. In such opposition stand the doctrines of these men to one another: and if we make a yet stricter enquiry into their writings, we shall find them as inconsistent with themselves as with one another.

Plato sometimes determines on three first principles, *God*, *matter* and *idea*; and sometimes on four, adding thereunto the *universal Spirit*: and when in a former place he had called matter *ingenerate*, he immediately afterwards calls it *generated*. In one place he gives idea its own original, calling it self existent, and again places it in the intelligencies of the mind.

In one place he asserts that whatever is made is corruptible, yet afterwards allows that some things which are made may be incorruptible and indissoluble. Whence comes all this disagreement of your wise men, both with one another, and with themselves? It is because they will not submit to be taught by those who know these things; but, confiding in the penetration of their own minds, suppose themselves capable of clearly comprehending the nature of heavenly things, although they are thus ignorant of the things on earth. As to the human soul, some of your philosophers describe it is as pervading the whole body, others as only circumscribing and surrounding it. And they are not only divided in their sentiments about the soul's animating the body; but as if their ignorance was infinitely divisible, they fall into contentious disputations about the soul itself: some holding it to be *fire*, some *air*; some *intellect*; some *motion*; others *vapour*, others again *potential virtue flowing from the stars*; others *numerical motion*; others *genial moisture*: in short every opinion among them is confused and incoherent: and in this one thing only do they appear commendable in the eyes of such as would investigate the truth of things, namely, that they have shewn a determined purpose to expose each other's ignorance.

Seeing then that it is impossible to learn the truths of religion from your teachers, who have given you such demonstrative proofs of their
 ignorance

ignorance by these their divisions among themselves. Let us now turn to the consideration of our ancestors: men who were in point of time long prior to your teachers: men who had no favourite nostrums to maintain, nor ever pretended to teach any thing as from themselves; neither were they ever found differing in their doctrines, or ever endeavouring one to subvert what another had said: But, free from all faction and strife, they delivered down to us that very doctrine which they themselves had received from God. For it is impossible for men, either by natural or acquired parts, ever to come to the knowledge of such sublime or divine truths; this knowledge is only obtained by a gift from heaven to holy men, and who have then no need of rhetorical arts, no need to make use of captivating and ensnaring words, but only to preserve themselves pure and fit for the energy of the holy spirit: which divine spirit descending from heaven, like the quill striking upon the strings of some harp or lyre, moves those holy men and makes them reveal to us the knowledge of divine and heavenly things. And this is the reason why these holy men, notwithstanding they ministred unto us these divine instructions at different times and places, have all of them, with one mouth and with one voice, in harmonious consent, taught us all that knowledge of God, of the creation of the world, of the formation of man, of the immortality of the human soul,

of

of a judgment to come after the end of this life, and also all other things which were necessary for us to know.

I shall begin with our first prophet and law-giver *Moses*: first shewing, from testimonies most worthy of being credited by yourselves, in what times he lived: for I shall not attempt to do this from our divine histories only, which you, by reason of the long imbibed errors of your ancestors, will not believe; but I shall do it from passages in your own historians wherein our religion is no ways concerned.

Know then that *Moses*, the first instructor in our religion, is antienter by much than all your wise men whether poets, historians, philosophers or legislators; of this we are certified from the histories of the Grecians. In the times of *Ogyges* and *Inachus*; whom some among you suppose to have been *sons of earth*, they make mention of *Moses* as a prince and ruler of the Jewish nation. For both *Polemon*, in the first part of his Grecian history, and *Apion* the son of *Possidonius* in his treatise against the Jews, as also in the fourth book of his histories, relate that when *Inachus* was king of the Argives, and *Amasis* was king of Egypt, the Jews revolted under their leader *Moses*. And *Ptolemy* the Mendesian in writing the transactions of Egypt concurs in these accounts; as do also these Athenian historians *Hellenicus*, and *Philochorus* in his *Atticks*, and *Castor*, and *Thallus* and *Alexander Polyhistor*; yea and those

those wisest of men Philo and Josephus, when treating on the affairs of the Jews, make express mention of Moses as a prince of that people in most antient times.

The same Josephus intending by the title of his books to intimate the antientness of the things contained in them, begins thus; *Flavius Josephus of the Jewish antiquities*, calling the antientness of the historical accounts, *antiquities*.

Diodorus the most eminent of all your historians, who epitomized whole libraries, and for thirty years as himself relates, travelled over all Asia and Europe with most exact inquiries, was himself an eye-witness of many transactions, and wrote no fewer than forty books of history, in his first book declares that he learnt from the Egyptian priests, that Moses was a very antient yea the first lawgiver: His words are these. "The antient learning of the Egyptians consisted in a mythological representation of their gods and heroes, and it is recorded that Moses was the first who persuaded the multitude to make use of written laws and to live by them, who was a man of the most exalted mind and most unblemished life." And a little further he proceeds, and, desirous to make mention of all the old lawgivers, speaks of Moses in the first place and in these words: "Moses among the Jews was called God; either because from his admirable and altogether divine mind they foresaw
" the

“ in him the people’s blessing; or because they
 “ judged that the people, who have always an
 “ eye to the personal dignity and virtue of those
 “ from whom they receive new laws, would by
 “ this means more readily obey. The second
 “ Egyptian lawgiver they say was Sauchnis, a
 “ man illustrious for wisdom. The royal Se-
 “ sonchis was their third, who excelled all their
 “ kings not only in martial achievements, but
 “ also in the arts of peace, whereby he civi-
 “ lized that warlike nation. King Bochoris
 “ was their fourth legislator, a man exceeding
 “ wise and politick. After him, they tell you,
 “ succeeded their King Amasis who composed a
 “ body of laws and was the first that constituted
 “ governors of provinces and the administration
 “ of publick justice throughout all Egypt, and
 “ Darius the father of Xerxes was their sixth
 “ lawgiver.”

Thus, O Grecians, have those who were
 not of our religion testified by their writings
 the great antiquity of Moses: and they ac-
 knowledge that they received all their informa-
 tion from the Egyptian priests among whom
 Moses was born, and by whom he was found
 worthy to be instructed in all their learning:
 who, while he sojourned in that country, was
 dignified by becoming the adopted son of the
 King’s daughter, and was for that reason in-
 structed with the greatest care and faithfulness.
 Such is the account given of Moses by those
 most judicious historiographers, Philo and Jo-
 sephus

sephus in their treatises purposely writ to describe his life, his actions and the dignity of his family. They, in their histories of the Jews, relate that he was descended of the race of the Chaldeans; that his ancestors by reason of a famine removed from Phœnicia into Egypt: and there Moses was born: that God for his exceeding great virtue preferred him in honour and made him a prince, ruler and law-giver to his nation, when he judged it fit to bring back that numerous race of Hebrews from Egypt into their own land.

Upon him God first vouchsafed that heavenly prophetick spirit to descend, which is poured out upon holy men. He was the first whom God thus qualified to be a teacher of our religion. After him there were other prophets partakers of the same gifts, and who instructed us in the same matters. These are the men whom we acknowledge to be the teachers of our holy religion: men who taught us nothing from their own invention, but wholly according to that gift of God descending upon them: But since, by prejudice from the long rooted errors of your forefathers, you cannot think yourselves obliged to believe these things, then tell us who those teachers of your religion are whom you can confide in? For, as I have often said, it is impossible for men, who have not been instructed therein by those who knew them, ever to attain the knowledge of such di-

vine

vine and sublime matters aright, or to instruct others therein.

Since now it seems sufficiently evident from the preceeding observations, that the works of your philosophers are full of ignorance and delusion, quitting all defence of these as before you did of your poets, will you turn to your fallacious oracles: for this I have heard from some: wherefore I think it proper to relate here what I have heard from yourselves on that head. You say that your Oracle, when consulted on this point, "Were ever any men born
" in the true religion?" gave this answer

*Chaldeans Heber's race are only wise ;
For they in holy worship reverence
The self originated God and king.*

When therefore you expect to learn the truth from your Oracle, and find the life of Moses written by men who were not of our religion concurring with this Oracle, and thereby know that Moses and the rest of the prophets were of the race of the Hebrew-Chaldeans, you ought not to think it strange if a man descended from this holy race, living holily himself and worshipping God according to the religion of his ancestors, was thus honoured of God with this greatest gift and made the first of all his prophets.

Proceed we now to enquire, in what times your philosophers lived. Here you will easily

perceive on one hand, that the time is but as of yesterday which brought them to you: as on the other hand you will perceive the very great antiquity of Moses.

That I seem not in this to protract the time in multiplying words and citing many evidences concerning times past, I shall be content with the following instances. Socrates was Plato's master, Plato was Aristotle's, and Plato and Aristotle lived in the times of Philip and Alexander, kings of Macedon: and in those times flourished your Athenian orators, as the orations of Demosthenes against Philip fully testify. Those historians who wrote the exploits of Alexander sufficiently certify that Aristotle lived with Alexander in the time of his reign: wherefore it is every way evident, that the writings of Moses are much antienter than any other writings whatsoever.

Neither can you be ignorant of this; that there is nothing writ by the Grecians with any kind of accuracy, nor any old writing extant either among Greeks or Barbarians prior to the Olympiads. The books of Moses our prophet, writ by divine inspiration, stood then single and alone: at this time the Greeks knew not the use of letters.

They who treat of the origin of letters inform us that letters are of later invention among the Grecians, and say that Cadmus first brought letters into Greece, having learned them from the Phœnicians. And Plato, esteemed

seemed by you the first of all the philosophers, testifies them to be of later invention: for in his *Timæus* he introduceth the wise *Solon* returning from Egypt, and telling Critias that an Egyptian priest a very old man addressed him thus: "O Solon, Solon, you Grecians are always children, there is not an old man among you." And at another time thus, "Ye are novices all your lives, you have neither an antient tradition, an antient honour, nor an old proverb among you; you have been kept ignorant of all things; your ancestors for many generations all died in oblivion for want of letters."

Know then that all history of the Grecian transactions was committed to writing, when writing it self was of much later date than the things thereby related: but whether we cast our eye on the antient poets, legislators, historians, philosophers or orators we find all their books written in Grecian characters.

If any should here object, that the writings of Moses and the prophets are also writ in Greek characters; such may know from other accounts than ours, that Ptolemy king of Egypt founded a library at Alexandria and filled it with books collected from all parts: and understanding that there were antient writings in Hebrew characters preserved with the greatest fidelity, he was very desirous to know what those books contained, therefore sent to Jerusalem for seventy learned men that understood

stood both the Hebrew and Greek languages, these he ordered to translate those writings: and that they might perform their work with more expedition and less disturbance, and might also finish every one his translation separately he ordered an equal number of cells to be built for them, not in the city, but at Pharos, distant from the city about seven furlongs: he also appointed men who should diligently minister to them all necessaries, but who withal should prohibit them all intercourse with one another; that by their agreement therein he might more exactly find out the veracity of the translation: and when he found that all these seventy men agreed not only in the sense, but also that they all used the same terms, differing not so much as in one expression, every one writing throughout the whole as all the rest had done, he was astonished: and being fully convinced that in the translation they had been guided by the spirit of God, he esteemed them as men beloved of God and worthy of all honour; bestowed on them many valuable presents and sent them back into their own country: The books, as he justly might, he held in great admiration, esteemed them as truly divine, and placed them in his library.

These things, O ye Grecians are not related as a fable or feigned Story, for we, who were at Alexandria, our selves saw the remains of the cells yet standing at Pharos, and what we now relate we had from the Inhabitants of that place

as what they had received from their forefathers by an undoubted tradition.

These things you may also learn from many others especially from those who have purposefully written concerning them, namely those wise and well approved men Philo and Josephus and many more.

If notwithstanding this, any should through a spirit of contradiction rashly object to us, that these books belong not to us but to the Jews who to this day preserve them in their synagogues: and that it is mere vanity in us to derive our religion from them: such objectors, may know from the things contained in them, that these books agree not with the Jews, but with *the doctrine of us christians*. And it is a singular instance of divine providence over us, that the books of our religion are still preserved by the Jews; inasmuch as not producing them from our own church we take away, from those who might otherwise object it to us, all appearance of fraud: and we think it honourable for us that we do produce them from the Jewish synagogue; that from the books still preserved by them, it may appear that the righteous laws, written for instruction by these holy men, clearly and manifestly belong to us. It behoveth you then, O Grecians, while you have an eye to things to come, and look towards that judgment preached not only by the true worshipers of God, but by others also, not to give yourselves up to the unexamined errors

errors of your forefathers, nor accept that for truth which they in delusion have handed down; but having an eye to the danger of falling from so great an hope, you ought to search and examine with the utmost exactness every thing which these masters, as you call them, have taught you. For they themselves, from that divine reasoning of the human mind, have often, against their inclinations, been forced to declare many things in our favour; especially those of them who have been in Egypt and have there benefited themselves by the religion of Moses and his ancestors.

Nor can I think any of you, who have been conversant in the history of Diodorus and of those other writers on this subject, ignorant how much Orpheus, Homer, the Athenian lawgiver Solon, Pythagoras, Plato, and those others who were in Egypt, profited from the writings of Moses: and how these afterwards maintained sentiments concerning their gods contrary to those which they had before falsely imbibed.

Orpheus who may be justly called the first teacher of Polytheism afterwards delivered to his son Musæus, and to the rest of his allied auditors, a very different doctrine, wherein he thus declares his belief of the one only God.

*Close shut your gates, y'unhallow'd and profane,
Justice allows you not my sacred sound;*

But

But thou Latona's son, Musæus, hear
 Truths yet untold: what thou hast learnt before
 Of ages yet to come is all a falsehood;
 Look to the word divine, on that lay hold,
 By that thy mind enlighten and thy paths
 Direct: with reverential eye behold
 The world's great King, the self existent One;
 By him all things created were; and he
 Pervades them all, all-seeing yet unseen.
 From him all good descends to man, and yet
 The formidable sword and bitter grief
 Are sharper rods in his all-ruling hand.
 He is the king supreme, none reigns but he:
 Beyond the limits of the human eye.
 On clouds most gloriously array'd he sits:
 His throne of purest gold; around him all
 The starry firmament resplendent shines.
 He ballances the ocean in his hand;
 His foot-stool makes the earth; at his approach
 Old ocean rises from his ouzy bed,
 The lofty mountains bend their tow'ring tops,
 And rapid rivers stop their rowling stream.

In another place he expresses himself thus,

Jove, Bacchus, Pluto, yea Latona's son
 With other diff'rent gods needless to name
 Each one's a Deity, but in one word
 The God supreme is all and in them all.

And in his oaths his words are these,

D

By

*By heav'n the work of the great God I swear,
I swear by th' Father's voice which first he gave
When he this world in consult with himself
Securely fix'd.*

What he here means by *the Father's voice which first he gave*, is plain, namely *the word of God*; That word by which God made the heaven and the earth and all the creation, as the divine writings of these holy men inform us; from which writings, when in Egypt, Orpheus in some measure understood how the whole creation was made; therefore when he saith, "I swear by the Father's voice which first he gave," he immediately subjoineth, "When he this world in consult with himself securely fix'd:" In which place he calls *word* by the name of *voice* only for the poetical measure of his verse; this is plain, because a little before where his verse allows it, he expressly calls it *word*, thus,

Look to the word divine on that lay hold.

Let us now turn our thoughts to what the antient *Sybil* teacheth in her oracles concerning the one only God, of whom Plato and Aristophanes with many others speak, as of one divinely inspired: now she in her oracles delivereth herself thus,

One

*One God supreme there is, and he's alone:
 He's infinite: He's the ingen'rate one.
 To his all-potent arm all things submit;
 All things ly open to his piercing eye,
 Yet sight of him no mortal eye sustains.*

Again thus,

*We greatly wand'red from the ways of God,
 When we the workmanship of man rever'd,
 Bowing the knee to senseless stocks or stones,
 Sculptur'd to gods or sculptur'd to frail men.*

In another place thus,

*All those shall happily the earth possess,
 Who strive with virtue and with cordial love
 Their God to please; and more delight in these
 Than in the pleasures of the grosser sense;
 Who seek the glory of the one great God,
 But temples and their altars disregard
 If fill'd with dumb and senseless Images
 Or Victims weltring in their blood and gore.*

thus the sybil. But the poet Homer emulating the sentiments which Orpheus first entertain'd runs into polytheism. and least he should in any thing differ from Orpheus's manner of writing, he abuses his poetical indulgence, fabulously recounting many gods. Yea he so studiously sets Orpheus for his pattern that he betrays his servile imitation of him in

his very first line: For whereas Orpheus begins thus,

*The direful wrath of fruitful Ceres sing
O heavenly goddess.*

Homer begins thus,

*The direful wrath of great Achilles sing
O heavenly Goddess.*

Whence it seems to me, that he chose rather to stretch the due measure of his verse, than not invoke, like Orpheus, the name of some Deity. But Homer afterwards with great judgment and clearness expresseth his own opinion of the one God, saying in the person of Phænix to Achilles thus,

*No not though God himself would me restore
The bloom I boasted and the port I bore.*

Il. ix. 445.

where by the pronoun *himself* he very fully denotes the one only God. Again in the person of Ulysses he thus addresseth the Grecian hosts

*No good e'er came from democratick rule,
Let one be king.*

and to shew the disadvantages of a republican government. he recounts to them what wars and bloodshed, what popular factions and conspiracies

racies they had been constantly harass'd with on that account: whereas saith he, monarchy is generally settled and peaceable. Thus far Homer.

Or would you have testimonies from the stage of the one true God, then hear Sophocles.

*With other truths, these also I profess:
There is one God; and he the heavens made;
He form'd the spacious earth: The rolling seas
And blust'ring winds acknowledge him their Lord.
But we deluded mortals greatly swerve,
We grossly wander from the ways of God
When we to senseless idols homage pay
Bowing to iv'ry or to golden gods,
And with our incense make their altars smoke,
Resting well pleas'd with pious duty pay'd.*
Thus Sophocles.

Pythagoras the son of Mnesarchus (who instilled his philosophick sentiments in mysterious representations, as the writers of his life make appear) he also entertained notions of the one God worthy of his travels into Egypt; for saying that the *monad* is the beginning of all things, and fountain of all good, he therein allegorically taught the existence of such a Deity as is the sole monarch of the universe. It is plain that this was Pythagoras's meaning, because he makes a great difference between the *monad* and *one*: the *monad* he makes to bear reference to things comprehended by the intellect

tellest, but the *one* to refer to *numbers*. But you have his opinion farther illustrated by himself in these words: " God is not one as some
 " imagine, one in distinction from the orna-
 " mented world, but one as containing the
 " whole in himself, viewing as from the center
 " all formations; the combination of all ages;
 " the spring of all power and efficient of all
 " works; the first principle of all things: He
 " is one light in heaven, Father of all, mind
 " and soul of the universe, motion of all the
 " spheres." Thus Pythagoras.

And Plato having learnt, as it would seem, from Moses and the prophets the knowledge of the one only God when he was in Egypt, yet fearing the fate of Socrates and the draught of hemlock, (that he might not excite another Anitus or Melitus to become his accusers also to the Athenian State, saying, Plato is a turbulent and seditious person not acknowledging the gods whom the city reverenceth,) harangueth on the gods in terms full of darkness and ambiguity; adapting his discourse so as seemingly to acknowledge gods to those who believed in them, which yet could easily be interpreted otherwise by such as disbelieved their being gods. This is very easily deduced from what he declares concerning them: for having first laid it down as an axiom, *That whatever is made is mortal*, he afterwards calls the gods, *made gods*: for when he maintains that all things had their beginning from God and Matter, he must necessarily

necessarily acknowledge that the gods are made of matter; and if of matter, which he calls the origin of evil, he then leaves it to such as are wise enough to draw the inference, to reflect on what kind of gods those are which are formed of matter. And this is the reason why Plato calls matter *ingenerate*; for if he did otherwise, he would seem to make God the creator of evil. And Plato speaks of gods formed by God in these words, "Gods of those gods whom I have formed." But it appears that he himself had right notions of the God that truly exists: for hearing in Egypt that God named himself to Moses by *I am that I am* when he was about to send him to the Hebrews; he knew that God did not thereby declare his peculiar name, seeing it is impossible for any proper name to be ascribed to God: for names are given to distinguish the nature and differences of things, which are many and various; but for God there was none found to give him a name, neither did he think it proper to name himself who is the one only self-existent Being, as he testifieth by his prophets saying, *I am the first and the last, and besides me there is no God*. Wherefore, as I said before, God in sending Moses to the Hebrews calls himself by no name, and yet by the use of one participle he mysteriously shews himself to be the one only God: for when he saith, *I am that I am*, he manifestly distinguisheth himself who is from those who are not; that they who were formerly

merly in error, might understand that they did not serve gods that had, but gods that had not existence.

And whereas God knew that the first race of men were not unmindful of that old deception of their forefathers, whereby the Devil, that enemy of mankind, counselled them to go astray, saying unto them, "If ye will hearken unto me in not obeying the commandment of God, then shall ye be as gods yourselves." Here calling what had no existence gods, that those men, by supposing there were other gods, might believe themselves capable of being made gods also. Wherefore God said unto Moses, *I am that I am* that by the word *am* he might put a difference between himself that had, and those gods that had no existence. But these men, hearkening to the Devil their deceiver, and daring to disobey God, were driven out of Paradise: yet still remembering to have heard of gods, and being no more instructed of God that there was none besides himself, (for it did not seem fit to teach those men any more who had not kept their first commandment, which yet was so easy for them to have kept, but to bring a just judgement upon them;) these men, I say, being cast out of Paradise, and supposing they were cast out for their disobedience only, and not also for their belief of gods which had no existence, transmitted this mention of gods to their posterity. So that
this

this first false notion of polytheism took its beginning from that *Father of lies*.

Now God, seeing this false notion of many gods spread like an epidemical disease through the minds of men, and desirous to abolish and root it out, when he first appeared to Moses, called himself the *I am that I am*. It being, as I suppose, absolutely necessary for him who was to become a prince and ruler of the Hebrew nation, to be first of all rightly instructed in the knowledge of the one God. Wherefore when God first appeared unto Moses, (as far as it was possible for God to appear unto man) he said unto him, *I am that I am*: and in sending him to the Hebrews, he said unto him, *Thus shalt thou say unto them, I am hath sent me unto you*.

Plato, learning these things in Egypt; was greatly pleased with what was thus spoken concerning the one God: yet through fear of the Areopagus he did not think it safe to mention the name of Moses to the Athenians, because he instructed men in the knowledge of the one only God: Therefore in his *Timæus* wherein he undertakes to treat of divine matters with the greatest accuracy, though he writes of God as Moses doth, yet he relates it not as what he had learnt in Egypt, but as if entirely from the intelligence of his own mind. His words are these: "It is my opinion that our first enquiry ought to be; What is that *Being* which is from eternity and never was made? and

E

also

“also, What that *Being* is which was made, “but is never of itself?” Doth not this O ye Greeks, appear the same thing to discerning minds, only differing in the manner of expressing one particle. What Moses calls the *I am*, Plato calls *That that is*: both of whose expressions are plainly applicable to the eternal God: for he is that Being which always exists and was never made.

But let us now diligently examine into the other question namely, What that Being is, which is opposed to that which always is; concerning which Plato saith, “Let us enquire “What that Being is which was made but is “never of itself?” And here we find him very plainly and clearly pronouncing that to be eternal which is *ingenerate*, and those which are *generated* or *formed* (according to what he saith is spoken of them, “Gods of those gods “whom I have formed”) to be generating and perishing. For this is plainly his sentiment from his following declaration; “It is my opinion our first enquiry ought to be, What is “that Being which is from eternity and never “was made? and also, What that Being is “which was made, but is never of itself? The “former may be conceived by the intellectual “faculty, as what agreeable to reason always subsists of itself. On the other hand, “What that Being is which was made yet never exists of itself; this can only be entertained in the imagination from corporeal sense

“sense, as what is formable, perishable and
 “might never have been.” These words, to
 the judicious mind, proclaim the extirpation
 and extinction of all made gods.

Nor will it be unnecessary to remark here
 that Plato calls not his God a *creator* but a *former*
 of the gods: which terms according to
 Plato himself, raise very different Ideas. A
 Creator being one that requires no materials,
 but who by his own inherent power and virtue,
 creates the Being created: whereas a Former
 (or *Maker*) is one who taketh his ability of
 formation from materials given him, of which
 he constructs his work.

But perhaps some, who are unwilling to de-
 part from the religion of polytheism, may say
 that the maker of the gods said unto the gods
 whom he had made, thus, “Inasmuch as you
 “are made, you are not immortal, nor whol-
 “ly indissoluble: but yet you shall not be dis-
 “solved, nor undergo death’s fatal power; for
 “this is my will towards you, and that is the
 “greatest and strongest security.” But what a
 strong instance is this of Plato’s dread of the
 worshipers of many gods, when he thus intro-
 duceth his maker of gods asserting things so
 contradictory! Before, he had introduced him
 declaring that “Whatsoever is made is corrup-
 “tible,” but now declaring the contrary. He
 considers not that hereby he can never free
 himself from the imputation of falshood. For
 it is either false which he said before “That

“ whatever is made is corruptible,” or now when he pronounceth of some things made, “ That they are free from it.”

If it necessarily follows, that whatsoever is made is corruptible, according to his first assertion, How can he here grant a possible impossibility? It is in vain then for Plato to gratify his making-God with a power which, according to the Demiurgus himself, it is impossible for him to have: Yet this he doth when he makes his Demiurgus in one place assert, “ That whatever is made of matter is corruptible,” and again to pronounce of some things made by him, that they are incorruptible, and indissoluble: for the property of matter, which according to his opinion is ingenerate, cotemporary and coeval with his forming-God, would seem to resist any such will; for he who did not create a thing can have no power to cause its non-existence; nor can any restraint be put upon that which, by the necessity of its own nature is free and independent.

Plato himself was very sensible of this when he wrote, “ We are necessarily obliged to acknowledge that no restraint can be put upon God.”

And why doth Plato eject Homer from his commonwealth, but because he introduceth Phænix in his embassy to Achilles addressing him thus, “ The gods themselves are flexible,” although it is certain that Homer speaks not here of the king, or, as Plato represents him, the maker of the gods, but of certain gods, such

as

as among the Greeks are very numerous, as we may learn from Plato himself saying, "Gods of gods." For Homer, in a beautiful connexion through his whole poem, always attributes to the one supreme God, power and dominion over all. He accounts all the other gods so far inferiour to his divinity as only fit to be ranked among men: whence he introduceth Uylsses inveighing against Hector to Achilles thus,

*Trusting in Jove he madly rushes on,
Of Gods or men regardless.*

From which passage I think it plain that Homer, as well as Plato, had learnt in Egypt the knowledge of the one God, having this before his eyes: *He that trusteth in God hath nothing else to fear.*

The same Poet, in another passage of equal significancy, points out the true God: for what Plato expresseth in a *verb*, enquiring "What that Being is which is from eternity and never was made," that doth Homer express by a *pronoun*: this I think is plainly designed in Phænix's speech to Achilles, thus.

*No not tho' God himself would me restore
The bloom I boasted and the port I bore,*

Il. ix. 445.

For the pronoun *himself* here points out the one only existent God.

The

The same is also signified by the Oracle's answer concerning the Hebrew-Chaldeans to the person consulting, "Were ever any men born in the true religion? and which answer you acknowledge to be thus,

*Chaldeans Heber's race are only wise;
For they in holy worship reverence
The self originated God and king.*

But how came the philosopher to accuse the poet for saying "The gods are flexible" when Homer spoke this for our comfort, and these words imply it? Ought not all men to forsake their sins and repent, who by prayers and sacrifices seek to propitiate the Deity? But how shall they, who imagine the Deity inflexible, ever resolve to repent and break off their sins, since they can expect no fruit of repentance?

Or why should the philosopher condemn the poet for saying, "The gods themselves are flexible," when himself introduceth his maker of gods of so wavering a mind as to assert of the same gods, that they are mortal, and again that they are immortal?

Nor doth Plato speak thus contradictorily only of the *matter* of which he saith they are necessarily made: For he sometimes calls matter ingenerate, and sometimes generated: He neither reflects that by making his Demiurgus of such variable sentiments, he involves him in the same crime of which he accuseth Homer;
nor

nor that Homer speaks of his supreme God in a manner the reverse to what he accuseth him, where he introduceth Jove speaking of himself, thus,

The nod that ratifies the will divine,

The faithful fix'd irrevocable sign.

From all which one cannot but conclude, that Plato uttered all these contradictions concerning the gods, contrary to his own sense of things, and entirely through fear of the embracers of polytheism: and that when he judg'd it necessary to relate what he had learnt from Moses and the prophets concerning the one God, these things he couch'd in mysterious expressions, such as might only insinuate his opinion to the worshippers of the true God.

And Plato was delighted with that expression of God to Moses, *I am that I am*: and contemplating much upon that short sentence, all comprized in one verb, he understood that God, willing to signifie to Moses his own eternity, called himself the *I am that I am*: by the *I am* manifesting his triunity of existence *I am*, he that was; *I am* he that is; *I am*, he that is to come. Plato also intimates a long duration of time to his made Being, though speaking of it, he calls it *That that never is*; for the *never* is not spoken in reference to the time past, as some imagine, but with respect to the time to come: for this point hath been exactly considered

considered by men of principles different from ours.

But when Plato was desirous to explain to the ignorant what was mysteriously spoken of the eternity of God by the *I am*, he thus comments upon it: "God himself, according to the antient Word, fills Infinity; he possesseth the beginning, the end, and the present of all." It cannot here be doubted but by the antient Word he means the Law of Moses; yet durst not mention Moses's name for fear of the hemlock. He knew that the Grecians detested the doctrine of Moses, yet by appealing to the antient Word, he plainly points him out: for his was the first and most antient law, as hath been already demonstrated from Diodorus and the other historians. Diodorus expressly asserts, that he was the first of all legislators, and that before the Greeks found out the use of letters whereby to write any of their historical accounts. Think it not strange therefore if Plato, instructed by Moses, wrote in this manner on the eternity of God.

You may also observe him mystically deriving from the only true God, that true knowledge of first principles which is in the prophetic writings: for in his *Timæus*, disputing of first principles, he writeth thus, "We, of necessity following the most probable reasons, have made our conjectures of the beginning of Fire and other Elements, but their beginning is well known to the God who is in
" heaven

“heaven, and to these men whom he loveth.” But what other men than Moses and the other prophets can Plato be here supposed to point out?

It must likewise have been from a perusal of the prophetick writings, and learning from them the doctrine of a judgment to come, that Plato lectureth thus in his first book of his commonwealth; “When any one thinks himself
 “at the point of death, he is then seized with
 “a fear and deep concern about things which
 “before had given him little trouble: these rumours of punishments inflicted in the infernal regions, for crimes committed, which
 “before he only turned into ridicule, now
 “greatly perplex his mind, least they should all
 “prove real and true: He now, either by reason of the infirmities of old age, or also from
 “apprehensions of the nearer approach of these
 “things, looks more narrowly into them and,
 “being full of suspicion and fear, calls himself
 “to an account, and examines if he has done
 “any injustice to any man: and if he finds
 “his past life full of iniquity, that man, like
 “children, frequently starts in his sleep, he is
 “terrified, and lives in despair. But the man,
 “who is conscious to himself of no injustice,
 “partakes of all that sweetness of hope which
 “Pindar very aptly calls the comfortable
 “nurse of old age. O Socrates, Pindar spoke
 “very graciously when he said this: the man,
 “who leads a righteous and holy life, hath a
 F sweet

“ sweet hope springing up in him which rejoiceth his heart, and nourisheth his old age: an hope which greatly sways the busy mind of men.”

Thus Plato in the first book of his commonwealth; but in the tenth book he is yet more plain in what he had learnt from the scriptures concerning a judgment to come. Notwithstanding, through fear of the Grecians, he delivers it not as what he had learned from the prophets, but as what he pretends to have heard from one slain in battle (such an one as he seems to have formed to himself) who on the twelfth day revived, when laid on his funeral-pile in order to his interment, and then revealed what follows. Plato speaks of this man thus. “ The man said, he was present when one enquired of another, *Where is Aridæus the great?* (Now this Aridæus had been a tyrant of a city in Pamphilia, and, as was reported, had murdered both his aged father and his elder brother, and had moreover committed many grievous crimes;) The enquirer, as the man said, was answered, He never appeared here, nor will he ever come to this place: That among other direful objects, he said, this one presented itself. On our return, as we approached the gate, on a sudden we perceived, among those who had suffered divers torments, Aridæus and many other tyrants, and many private persons also who had committed flagitious crimes. These now expected

“pected to return; but the gate (which hide-
 “ously bellows out against all those whose
 “wickedness had been incurable, if any
 “such attempt to return before they have suf-
 “ficiently attoned for their crimes,) bellowed
 “out against them and would not receive them.
 “Then terrible men, whose aspect was fierce
 “and glaring, on hearing the dreadful roar;
 “immediately rush forth and separating the
 “rest, conducted them forth: But binding Ari-
 “dæus and others, head, feet and hands toge-
 “ther, they threw them down, tore the skin
 “from their flesh, and drag’d them forth along
 “the way over briars and thorns, in that dou-
 “bled posture, proclaiming to all present the
 “crimes for which they were thus punished,
 “and thus cast them down into Tartarus. And
 “he affirmed, That although horror was pre-
 “sented to them in all shapes and forms, yet
 “this exceeded all the rest; if on their return
 “the gate bellowed out upon any: as on the
 “other hand, no happiness can be equally felt
 “with theirs whom it silently emits. And
 “said, as there, the wicked are in this manner
 “justly punished; so in that place there are op-
 “posite rewards for the righteous.”

Now from this I infer, that Plato had not
 only learnt from the holy scriptures, the do-
 ctrine of a judgment to come, but also the
 doctrine of a resurrection which you Grecians
 reject. For to speak of the soul as condemn’d
 in a body, can imply no less than the belief of

the resurrection of the body. How could Arideus and the rest suffer a punishment of this nature in hell, when they left their bodies, head, hands, feet and skin upon the earth? Will they say the soul hath head, hands, feet and skin? Plato then must have received in Egypt, from the testimony of the prophets, the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, and here teacheth that the soul is to be judged with it.

And not only Plato but Homer likewise learnt in Egypt the same doctrine: for Ulysses saith, it was revealed by necromancy to Alcinous that Tytius was punished thus,

*There Tytius large and long; in fetters bound,
O'erspreads nine acres of infernal ground;
Two rav'nous vultures, furious for their food,
Scream o'er the fiend, and riot in his blood,
Incessant gore the liver in his breast,
Th'immortal liver grows, and gives th'immortal feast.*

Odys. xii. 646.

Now it is certain, liver is not a property of the soul but of the body.

That Homer was in Egypt, and transmitted what he had learnt there through the whole of his works, is fully shewn by that most eminent historian Diodorus: He tells us that in Egypt Homer learnt that Hellen brought with her to Sparta the Nepenthe, which is a pleasant

sant potion causing the unfortunate to forget all their calamities. This Nepenthe Hellen received from Polydamna the wife of Theon; and with this, in the presence of Telemachus, she used to assuage her bitter grief on the account of Menelaus. He tells us that Homer gave Venus the epithet *golden*, because he understood that in Egypt there was a place called, the *grove of the golden Venus*, and the *field of the golden Venus*. But why do I mention these things? I mention them to shew that the poet interwove his poem with very many things which he had learnt from the prophetic writings: as first, the beginning of the creation is thus represented by Moses. *In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth: Yea he made the Sun the Moon and the stars also.*" This he learnt in Egypt, and pleased with this description of the creation, he makes Vulcan form a representation of it upon Achilles's shield, thus:

*There shone the image of the master mind:
 There earth, there heav'n, there ocean he design'd;
 Th'unwearied sun, the moon compleatly round;
 The starry light that heav'n's high convex crown'd:
 The Pleiads, Hyads, with the northern team;
 And great Orion's more refulgent beam;
 To which around the axle of the sky,
 The bear revolving points, his golden eye
 Still shines exalted on th'ætherial plain,
 Nor bathes his blazing forehead in the main.*

Il. xviii. 482.

To

To preserve an idea of paradise, he forms Alcinous's garden after its pattern: making it like paradise always in a flourishing bloom, and always ripe with fruit, thus,

*Tall thriving trees confest the fruitful mold,
The red'ning apple ripens here to gold,
Here the blue fig with lucious juice o'erflows,
With deeper red the full pomegranate glows,
The branch here bends beneath the weighty pear,
And verdant olives flourish round the year.
The balmy spirit of the western gale
Eternal breaths on fruit untaught to fail;
Each dropping pear a following pear supplies,
On apples, apples, figs on figs arise;
The same mild season gives the blooms to blow
The buds to harden and the fruit to grow;
Here ordered vines in equal ranks appear
With all th'united labours of the year.
Some to unload the fertile branches run,
Some dry the blackning clusters in the sun.
Others to tread the liquid harvest join,
The groaning presses foam with floods of wine:
Here the vines in early flow'r descry'd
Here grapes discolour'd on the sunny side
And there in autumn's richest purple dy'd* }

Odys. 7.

What can give a more lively imitation of Moses's paradise than you here meet with? and if you turn your eyes to the building of the tower of *Babel* by which the men of that time thought to ascend heaven; you may find an allegorical

allegorical representation thereof in the persons of Otus and Ephialtes, thus,

*Proud of their strength and more than mortal size;
The gods they challenge and affect the skies;
Heav'd on Olympus tott'ring Ossa stood;
On Ossa Pelion nods with all his wood.*

Odys. II.

*Hence Ephialtes, hence stern Otus sprung
More fierce than giants, more than giants strong,
Such were the youths! had they to manhood grown,
Almighty Jove had trembled on his throne.*

Odys. II.

Moreover that enemy of mankind, cast down from heaven, whom the holy scriptures call the Devil, a name given him from his accusing and doing evil to man; him we find lively described by the poet, not indeed under the same name, yet by a name equally denoting the evil of his deeds, namely *Ate* (that is *mischief*) Her the poet represents as cast out of heaven by the Almighty, in a manner that seems only a transcript of the prophet Isaiah, thus

*Grief seiz'd the thunderer, by his oath engag'd,
Stung to the soul he sorrow'd and he rag'd,
From his ambrosial head, where perch'd she sate,
He snatch'd the fury-goddes of debate,
The dread, th'irrevocable oath he swore
Th'immortal seats should ne'er behold her more,
And*

*And whirl'd her headlong down, for ever driv'n
From bright Olympus and the starry heav'n:
Thence to the nether world the fury fell,
Ordain'd with man's contentious race to dwell.*

Il. xix. 125.

And whence did Plato, after he had spoken of God and matter, take his notion of a third principle, calling it *Idea*, but from Moses? He learnt from Moses's words the name of *Idea*, but having no instructor, he could know nothing without much mysterious speculation concerning the things of which Moses spake.

Moses, according to what God had spoken to him concerning the tabernacle, writeth thus: *According to all that I shew thee, after the pattern of the tabernacle, and the pattern of all the instruments thereof, even so shall ye make it. And again, Look that thou make it after the pattern that was shewed thee in the mount.* And a little after: *According to the form and fashion which I shewed thee in the mount, even so shalt thou make it.* Plato, meeting with these words, and not fully weighing them, imagined that *Idea* was some real and distinct existence, and that prior to its being made a sensible object, and accordingly he often calls it the *pattern* according to which all things are made; being induced thereunto because Moses, speaking of the tabernacle, saith he was directed in its formation thus, *Look that thou make it according to the form shewed thee in the mount.*

Plato

Plato run into the same error with respect to the creation of the earth, heaven, and man. Because Moses wrote *In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth*; and subjoins *And the earth was without form, and void*: Plato supposed from that expression *The earth was*, that this earth was spoken off as præexisting, because Moses saith concerning it; *The earth was without form, and void*. And whereas Moses saith, *God created the heaven and the earth*; Plato supposed that Moses thereby meant, that the earth was then made into a sensible object which before præexisted in *idea*.

Plato had the same mistaken notion of heaven: the created heaven which Moses calls *Firmament*, he thought was then only made perceptible to sense; but that there was another *ideal heaven*, and that the prophet spoke of this ideal heaven when he saith, *The heaven of heavens is the Lord's, but the earth hath he given to the children of men*.

In like manner did Plato err as to man. Moses makes a former mention of man, but records not his formation until after that of many other creatures, then he saith, *And God made man of the dust of the earth*: hence Plato concluded, that as the name of man was formerly mentioned, he must have had an existence prior to that formation: and that he, who was afterwards made of the dust of the earth, was made according to that præexistent form.

Homer likewise understood from the holy scriptures, that man was made of the dust of the earth, and calls Hector's body dead earth. And whereas it is said, *Dust thou art, and to dust shalt thou return*: he saith of Achilles dragging the dead body of Hector, thus

*Lo how his rage dishonest drags along
Hector's dead earth insensible of wrong!*

Il. xxiv. 49.

In another place he introduceth Menelaus chiding those who were averse to Hector's challenge to the single combat, thus

*Go then, resolve to earth from whence ye grew,
A heartless, spiritless, inglorious crew!
Be what ye seem inanimated clay!*

Il. vii. 99.

In his excess of passion thus wishing them all reduced to earth their antient and first state. Homer and Plato learning these things from the old Egyptian records, thus transmitted them in their own writings. Or who taught Plato to say that Jupiter rides in the heavens on a flying chariot? Was it not from the holy scriptures thus describing the Cherubim? *When the glory of the Lord departed from the threshold of the house and stood over the Cherubims: then did the Cherubims lift up their wings, and the wheels besides them; and the glory of the God of Israel was over them above.* It was this inspired

spired the eloquent Plato and made him cry out in rapture,

*Great Jove his flying chariot drives
Above the azure sky!*

Whence could Plato receive such sentiments if not from Moses and the prophets? Or whence drew he notions of God's existing in a fiery essence? Was it not from the third book of the kings, where it is written: *But the Lord was not in the wind: and after the wind an earthquake: but the Lord was not in the earthquake: and after the earthquake a fire; but the Lord was not in the fire; and after the fire a still small voice.* These words holy men ought to meditate upon with study and deep contemplation: but Plato not sufficiently weighing them supposed God was a fiery essence.

And he who diligently attends him further will find that the gift of God, which the sacred scriptures call the *Holy Spirit*, is also spoken of by Plato in his Menon but under a different name: For though he durst not call this gift of God, *the Holy Spirit*, lest, following the doctrine of the prophets, he should seem an enemy to the Greeks: yet he confesseth it to be a gift from God, calling it not indeed *Holy Spirit* but by the name of *virtue*. In his book of reminiscence he asks Menon these questions about Virtue. "Is
" virtue acquired by instruction? Or is it ac-

“quired by practice? Or is it neither acquired
 “by practice or instruction but comes by na-
 “ture, or comes it some other way?” Then
 he determines thus: “After all our reasoning
 “upon this subject, if we rightly discuss it, we
 “shall own, that virtue is neither the work of
 “nature, or of education, but that those
 “who obtain it, obtain it by a divine decree;
 “yet not without regard had to the mind of
 “the receiver.”

What Plato had thus learnt from the prophets concerning the *Holy Spirit*, that he plainly transferred to the name of Virtue. And in like manner as the holy prophets say this same Spirit is divided into seven Spirits, so doth Plato say, this one and the same Virtue, as he calls it, is divided into four virtues. Though he never names Holy Spirit, yet in an allegorical way he attributes to his Virtue the same things which the prophets had declared of the Holy Spirit. For in the conclusion of his speech to Menon, he saith, “From our
 “reasoning, O Menon, it appears that those
 “who obtain virtue, obtain it by a divine decree: but we shall then more perfectly understand what way it is conveyed to man,
 “after we shall first thoroughly examine where-
 “in its nature consists.”

You see he avoids calling that Gift of heaven by any other name than that of virtue, and yet makes it a dispute, if that or some other be a proper name for it: still fearing to call it
 an

an Holy Spirit, lest he should be reputed a disciple of the prophets.

Or whence came Plato to this knowledge, Time had its beginning with the heavens? for his words are, "Time is of equal date with heaven, that taking their beginning together, they may together be dissolved, when the time of their dissolution is come." Did not he learn this from the sacred books of Moses? He knew that the origin of time had its source from the constituting of days, months and years: and that when the first day was constituted according to the heavens, then was the beginning of time: according to what Moses wrote, *In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth*; who a little after adds, *And the evening and the morning were the first day*. But Plato doth not say the day was created with the heavens, lest he should seem a disciple of Moses, and fall under the censure of the Athenians; yet he calls a day *time*, therein denoting a part by the whole.

Or whence took Plato his opinion of the dissolution of the heavens but from the prophets whom he so understood?

Or how shall we account for the origin of Images? why were the first makers of your gods induced to make them after the likeness of men? was it not because they took those notions from the holy scripture? it was because, in the books of Moses, God is recorded saying, *Let us make man in our image, after*
our

our likeness. This being the same as to say, men are in shape like unto God: they hence began to form their gods, imagining that they gave them a divine form or image by giving them an human.

But why, O ye Grecians, have I undertaken to recount all these things? It is, that you may know how impossible it is for those men to teach you the true religion, who could produce none of these things themselves, for which they have been had by you in such admiration: Their sentiments, are all borrowed from Moses and the prophets, and only disguised in types and allegories in their delivery of them.

Is it not full time then, O Grecians, for you to be perswaded from your own histories, That Moses and the other prophets lived in times long before the most antient of your wise men?

Is it not time for you to quit those antient errors of your forefathers, and to apply yourselves to the divine writings of the prophets, and learn from them the true religion? These men studied not the arts of rhetorick purely to gain belief; (means made use of by those who would steal away the truth;) but contenting themselves with a simple narration, they made use of the very words and names of things, how simple soever they were; thereby relating, to those who are willing to learn the true religion, whatever the holy spirit then coming upon them, directed them to relate.

Wherefore

Wherefore think it no shame to turn from the antient errors of these men, and from that pompousness of expression from which you look for so great advantage, and embrace what is truly profitable for you.

You can never commit an offence against your ancestors, if you are only desirous of renouncing their errors, who are now, as is probable in great affliction among the shades below, lamenting their former errors: who, if they could speak from thence, would now tell you what evils have come upon them since their departure hence, and how willing they are that you should shun them. But seeing in your present state you can never be informed by them, nor ever be rightly instructed by those who, pretending to philosophise, deliver you such a false philosophy, it remains that, forsaking the delusion of your forefathers, you attend to the prophecies of these holy men, (not expecting in them an elegant composition of words, for our religion consists not in words but in works,) and in them you shall find the words of eternal life.

But these men vainly invade the name of philosophy, and are convicted of their ignorance, as themselves are forced against their inclinations to confess, in that they not only fall into contentions with one another, but also produce opinions in one place quite contrary to their assertions in another: If the investigation of truth be the whole design of philosophy; they
are

are not worthy the name of philosophers, who have not yet arrived at it.

If Socrates, the wisest of all your wise men, of whom your own Oracle gave this testimony, "Socrates exceeds all men in wisdom," If he confesseth that he knows nothing, why do those who come after him profess a full knowledge of all heavenly things? Socrates saith men called him wise, because when other men pretend to know things they were wholly ignorant of, he disdained not to confess his ignorance of all things. His words are these, "For this small thing I seem the wisest of men, because I do not think that I know what I know not." Neither did Socrates speak this ironically and out of an affected ignorance, as his manner often was in conversation: for his last words, when going to prison, sufficiently testify with what truth and seriousness of mind he confessed his ignorance, thus, "The time of our departure hence is at hand; I to my death, you to your former manner of life: but whether yours or mine is the more desirable condition, that is only known to God." Socrates bequeathed this his last speech in the Areopagus; then hasted to prison, in which he attributes to God alone the knowledge of those matters which are to us full of obscurity: yet these his successors, though ignorant of what pertains to themselves on earth, pronounce as confidently of heavenly things as if they had seen them with their eyes.

Aristotle,

Aristotle, as if he had seen farther into the heavens than Plato, saith, "God is not in a fiery essence as Plato saith, but that there is a fifth æthereal element in which God is." And by the force of his eloquence he gains credit: yet this man, out of vexation and fret, put an end to his life because he was not able to resolve the ebbing and flowing of the Euripus, an arm of the sea that washes Chalcis.

Let no wise man then build his safety upon the eloquence of these men: rather according to the story of old, let him stop his ears with wax against the melodious accents of these destructive Syrens. These men, baiting you with their eloquence, as with a delicious morsel, seem determined to seduce as many as they can from the true religion, herein imitating him who first seduced mankind into a notion of many Gods: Wherefore I earnestly intreat you hearken not unto them, but apply yourselves to the doctrine of our holy prophets.

But if you yet have an aversion thereunto: If the old superstition of your ancestors be still an obstacle to your receiving the prophecies of these holy men, whereby alone you can be instructed in, that first lesson of true piety, the knowledge of the one God: then at least hearken to him who indeed at first taught you polytheism, but afterwards writ that useful and necessary recantation of that doctrine, as I have a little before related: Hearken I say, to Orpheus, and also to those others who agree

gree with him in their notions of the one God: For it is an instance of divine providence over us, that our very adversaries are forced to testify the truth of what our prophets have spoken of the one God; that, when the doctrine of polytheism is rejected by all, you may have freer access to the truth.

Neither will it be difficult for you to learn the true religion in some measure from that ancient *Sybil*, who, by a very powerful inspiration, instructs you in her oracular responses, and which come nearest to the doctrine of the prophets.

Of this Sybil it is reported that she was driven out of Babylon: that she was the daughter of Berofus who wrote the history of the Chaldeans: that by some means or other, she came and settled at Cumæ in Campania, six miles from the hot baths at Baia, where she delivered her oracles. And when we were at Cumæ, we saw the place, wherein was a prodigious Basilic all cut out of one stone, a stupendous and amazing work. Here this Sybil gave forth her oracles, as the people, from an unquestioned tradition of their forefathers, informed us. In the midst of this Basilic were three cisterns hewn out of the Basilic itself, in which, being filled with water, the Sybil used to bath: then, slipping on her loose garb, retired into the inmost recess of the Basilic, which also was cut out of the same stone; where sitting

ting on an exalted throne, she delivered her oracles.

Many have made mention of this Sybil, as of an undoubted Oracle, particularly Plato in his *Phædrus*: for it seems to me that Plato, meeting with her oracles, ascribed an inspiration to the author. He saw her predictions accomplished, and, struck with admiration, in his book to *Menon*, speaks in praise of the prophets in this punctilious manner. “If we
“rightly account those persons divine who are
“endowed with the gift of prophecy, are not
“those also inspired and agitated by a divine
“impulse, and possessed of the God, who declare many things about the most weighty
“affairs very justly, at the same time not understanding any of those things whereof they
“then speak.”

It is very clear and evident that Plato in this had an eye to the Sybil's verses: for she had not, like the poets, a power to revise and correct her own works, and thereby adjust them to poetical measures: but she, in the very time of her inspiration, finished her prophecy; and the moment that that inflatus ceased, that moment she forgot all she had said; for which reason the measures of her verses are not all of them entire.

While we were in this city our conductors shewed us the very places where the oracles were delivered by the prophets, and the brazen urn in which her reliëts were deposited:

and among other things they told us, as an undoubted tradition from their ancestors, that they who wrote down the oracles, being men of no letters, many times erred in the poetical measures, from whence also arose that inaccuracy in the verses; that the prophetess, when the inspiration, by which she was moved, ceased, being under an entire forgetfulness of what she had spoken, and the men illiterate, the inaccuracy was irremediable: whence, it is plain, that Plato had an eye to the verses of this Sybil, when speaking of the Oracles he said, "They declare many things about the most weighty affairs very justly, at the same time understanding none of those things of which they speak."

Wherefore, ye Greeks, seeing the true religion is neither found among the poets, nor in that kind of erudition so much esteemed by you; set aside those nicer compositions whether in verse or prose, and, free from contentious dispositions, attend unto this Sybil's words, and consider the good she offers you in her clear revelation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ: who, being the Word of God, and of power inseparable from him, took our nature upon him, and the form of a man made after the image of God, and recalled to our minds the true religion of our forefathers, from which their children, at the instigation of the envious spirit, were turned aside, and drawn to the worship of imaginary Gods.

And

And if any scruples arise in your minds about the formation of man, believe those whom you suppose you ought to hearken unto; and know this, that your Oracle, when requested so to do, sung an hymn to the omnipotent God; and in the midst of that hymn, saith

Adam, the first man form'd, his God him nam'd.

This hymn is still in the hands of many whom I myself know, and is a conviction of their error who disbelieve a truth so fully attested by all.

Finally, O Grecians, unless you esteem the deceitful representation of the imaginary gods of these men, as more precious than your own salvation, hearken, as I said before, to what that antient Sybil saith (whose books are preserved throughout the world) of those who are called gods, for she instructs you, by a powerful inspiration, in her oracles that they are no gods, and moreover clearly foretold the coming of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and all those things which he should perform: for the knowledge of these things will be a necessary preparatory induction to the holy scriptures.

But if any do still expect to be taught the knowledge of God from the antient philosophers, as you call them, let them attend to what Hermes and Acmon say. Acmon in his discourse on God, calls him, "A Being wholly
"concealed from us." Hermes fully and openly

penly professes thus, "It is difficult to comprehend God in our minds; or if we may comprehend him in our mind, yet is it impossible to express our Ideas of him." Wherefore we must be every way convinced that we can come by no other means to the knowledge of God or the true religion than by the prophets alone who instruct us by Inspiration from God.

St.

St. JUSTIN

The PHILOSOPHER and MARTYR, his
second Exhortation to the *GENTILES*.

THINK not, O Grecians, that my separation from your religious Rites is without reason or without duely weighing the matter; for I found nothing holy or acceptable to God in them. The religious sentiments of your poets, as they have ordered the matter, are so many records of unrestrained madness and intemperance: and the man, who applies to the most eminent men among you for instruction, will find himself embarrass'd under more difficulties than all other men. For your poets chiefly relate how Agamemnon by abetting the intemperance, mad passions and ungoverned affections of his brother, disdained not both to offer up his daughter a sacrifice and to disturb the peace of all Greece merely to regain Hellen who had been forcibly carried off by a fordid shepherd: That, in the course of this war Agamemnon, having taken many captives, was himself made a slave to the daughter of Chryses; and how on Bryseis's account irreconcilable quarrels arose between him and Achilles: How the swift-footed Achilles, who conquered Hector, and laid Troy in ashes, was enslav'd by Polyxena and slain, himself
being

being made a love-potion-sacrifice in the temple of Apollo, when he had laid aside his celestial armour, and had deck'd himself in his marriage attire, his splendid sponsalia.

They tell you how Ulysses from stratagems acquired the fame of excelling in wisdom, yet gave a proof of his deficiency herein, in not daring to trust to his wisdom to stop his ears when sailing by the Syrens: They tell you that Ajax, the son of Telamon, the valiant wearer of the seven-fold shield, turned mad when the decision of Achilles's armour was given against him in favour of Ulysses.

These are things I am not solicitous to be instructed in: it is not such virtue that I desire, therefore I give little attention to Homer's fables: for in all that rhapsody of both the Iliad and Odyssey, one woman is the principal subject.

After Homer comes Hesiod, and he gives you an account of the source of time and origin of things. But who can assent to his trifling Theogony? These poets tell you that Saturn was the son of Cælum: That he dethroned his father and assum'd the administration, who, fearing the same fate from his own children, determined to devour them all and to eat them; but that Jupiter, by a stratagem of the Cretians, was privately conveyed away and concealed, who afterwards bound his father in chains and divided the monarchy between himself and brethren; that he assigned the dominion of the
sea

sea to Neptune, gave Pluto the infernal regions, and kept the heavens to himself? they tell you also that Pluto stole away Proserpine; how Ceres wandered through the most desolate Places in quest of her daughter; and that the lighted torches in her mysteries, viz the Eleusinian, eternize the story: How Neptune ravished Melanippe when she came to draw water; how he also defiled no small number of Nereids, all of whose names would be too tedious to enumerate.

As to Jupiter, we find him an adulterer under many shapes; to gain Antiope he became a satyr; for Danae, a shower of gold; for Europa, he turned himself into a bull; for Leda he assumed the swan; his love to Semele betrays both his lewdness and Juno's jealousy: to obtain the Phrygian Ganemede, he made him his cup bearer: such was the behaviour of the sons of Saturn. And even the far-fam'd son of Latona who professed divination, falsified his art, when he pursued Daphne to no purpose; neither foretold he to Achilles his death, when one laid wait for it, although he consulted him therein.

I shall pass by the masculine behaviour of Minerva: the effeminacy of Bacchus, and the lewd life of Venus.

Make known then, O Grecians, to Jupiter the laws of parricide, the punishments of adultery, and the disgrace of pederasty. Inform Minerva and Diana of the duties proper to
I women;

women, and Bacchus of those that belong to men. Can military accoutrements be any ornament in female dress? Or what shall I say of the man who, in all the attire and decorations of women, with all the softnesses of musick celebrates in the assemblies of women the Bacchanalian rites? And yet this in the honour of the valiant Hercules the son of Jove. This man who slew a lion; cut off the Hydra's head; slew the wild boar of Erymanthus; destroyed the flying harpies those devourers of men; drag'd the three-headed monster Cerberus from hell; cleansed the Augean stable; kill'd those bulls and that stag whose nostrils breathed out fire; brought away the golden fruit from the tree, and kill'd the poison-darting dragon that watched it; he who also slew Achilous for causes not to be mentioned, and Busiris the murderer of his guest; who travers'd the highest mountains to get a water, as is said, to make his voice more tuneable; even this man, who, performed such mighty deeds, could submit like a boy to warble his voice to the satyr's lyre, and, enslav'd by the love of a woman, could suffer himself to be whipt like a child by the deriding Lyde: And at the last, when he could not tear off the poisoned shirt, he reared his own funeral-pile and put an end to his life. Nor let Vulcan be longer jealous, or repine when he is grown both old and lame, if Mars, full of youth and beauty is preferred before him.

Thus,

Thus, O Grecians, do your gods stand convicted of lust, and your heroes of effeminacy; this your histories also manifest, which have furnished such matter for tragedians: witness the horrid revenge of Atreus, the incest of Thyestes; the detestible crimes of the Pelopidæ; the story of Danaus who having no sons, through envy and in a drunken fit, instigated the death of all the sons of his brother; the banquet of Thyestes which the Furies prepared; the continued lamentations of the winged Procne and her Cecropian sister whose tongue was cut out, yet who still sends forth an hissing noise.

But why should I mention the story of Oedipus with his perforated feet? Or how he slew his father Laius, married his mother, and how his children and kindred slaughtered one another.

Your public conventions and assemblies with all their unbounded luxury I detest. As also all your musical instruments of exquisite workmanship exciting you to the most frantick gestures, your unnecessary unguents, your garlands filleted on your heads; in all this group of evils you delineate your own shame: You intoxicate yourselves with such bacchanal riots, and thence run headlong into all impurities.

Allow me now to make this one remark further: with what justice, O ye Gentiles, can you reprove your sons, should they in imitation of your Jupiter, either lay snares for your lives, or defile your beds? Why should you judge your

son an enemy and yet worship him whom your son imitates? Why expostulate at your wife's lewdness, yet honour Venus with temples?

If such accounts had been only found in the writings of your adversaries, they might have passed for slanders and forgeries: but on the contrary they are the songs of your own poets, and the narration of your own historians.

At last then, O Gentiles, come and partake of that wisdom which cannot be objected against. Be instructed by lessons truly divine. Learn to know the immortal King, and acknowledge not those for Heroes who commit such rage and violence upon the People. But our heavenly King requires not of us strength of body, nor comeliness of features, or loftiness of an high birth, but a mind that is pure and shielded by holiness: His holy word is daily directing us to holy actions, and to his holy ordinances. The energy of this word reacheth to the soul: The soul as by the sound of a Trumpet is hereby called from a state of war to a state of peace. Oh, that banisher of troublesome passions! Oh holy doctrine extinguisher of those living fires! It doth not make us poets; it constitutes us not philosophers, or skilful rhetoricians, but by its instructions, from mortal it makes us immortal: from frail men it makes us gods, and from this earth transplants us into regions above the heavens.

Come then; be instructed; be ye as I am, who once was as you are; the divinity of this word,

word, and efficacy of the doctrine were what laid hold on me. For as the skilful musician first charms the dreadful snake from his lurking hole, then drives him away: so doth this word draw from the inward recesses of the soul all the affections of sense, and especially covetousness, that formidable root of all evils, such as contentions, strife, envy, emulations, wrath and the like, which being expelled, the soul regains a perfect calm and tranquillity; and when thus freed from those chains that weighed it down, it mounts to its Creator again, it being but suitable that it should return to the place, from whence it borrowed its original.

The E N D.

E R R A T U M.

Page 27 line 28 for *Samnian* read *Samian*.